

1 [Counsel identified on signature page]
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 OAKLAND DIVISION

11 EOLAS TECHNOLOGIES
12 INCORPORATED,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.
15 AMAZON.COM, INC.,

16 Defendant.

17 Case No. 4:17-cv-03022-JST

18 Related to Case Nos. 4:17-cv-01138-
JST, 4:17-cv-03023-JST, and 4:15-
cv-05446-JST

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
**JOINT STIPULATION OF
EOLAS TECHNOLOGIES
INORPORATED AND
WALMART, INC. REGARDING
SUBSTITUTE EXPERT AND
REPLACEMENT EXPERT
REPORT**

1 Pursuant to the Court's guidance at the June 8, 2021 Case Management Conference
 2 Defendant Walmart Inc. ("Walmart") and Plaintiff Eolas Technologies Incorporated ("Eolas")
 3 (collectively the "Parties") provide this joint stipulation and proposed order regarding the
 4 replacement of Walmart's non-infringement expert David McGoveran due to health issues.
 5 Walmart has confirmed the availability of substitute expert Dr. Andrew Cromarty, and the parties
 6 have agreed that Walmart may substitute in Dr. Cromarty for Mr. McGoveran and provide a
 7 replacement non-infringement report.

8 While Dr. Cromarty's replacement report need not be identical to the March 31, 2017
 9 Rebuttal Expert Report of David McGoveran Regarding U.S. Patent No. 9,195,507 (the
 10 "McGoveran Report"), the Parties have agreed that Dr. Cromarty's replacement non-infringement
 11 report shall not espouse any opinions or theories not found in the McGoveran Report, and Dr.
 12 Cromarty may not address claim limitations not addressed by the McGoveran Report. Dr.
 13 Cromarty's report must otherwise be substantially similar to the McGoveran Report and must not
 14 be contrary to or inconsistent with the findings, opinions, and theories presented in the McGoveran
 15 Report. Dr. Cromarty may not testify in any manner that is contrary to or inconsistent with the
 16 McGoveran Report. *See In re Northrop Grumman Corp. ERISA Litig.*, No. 06-CV-06213, 2016
 17 WL 6826171, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2016) ("While the opinions need not be identical, it is
 18 reasonable to limit the new expert to findings that are substantially similar to those presented by
 19 [the prior expert]. . . . [The new expert] may not testify in any manner that is contrary to or
 20 inconsistent with [the prior report].); *Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC*, No. 12-cv-03587-
 21 WHO, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 162733, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2014) ("the new expert must limit
 22 his or her opinions to the subject matter covered in [the original] report and may not testify in any
 23 manner that is contrary to or inconsistent with [the original report]"); *Park v. CAS Enterprises, Inc.*,
 24 No. 08-CV-385, 2009 WL 4057888, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2009) (New expert "may not,
 25 however, espouse any other opinions or theories not found in [prior] expert reports. It would be
 26 both prejudicial and unduly burdensome to [party] to allow submission of new expert reports with
 27 new theories and opinions. It would also be unduly prejudicial to [party] to allow [adversary] to
 28 prepare new expert reports after having had the benefit of [party's] expert reports for several

1 months."); *U.S. ex rel. Agate Steel, Inc. v. Jaynes Corp.*, No. 2:13-CV-01907, 2015 WL 1546717,
 2 at *2 (D. Nev. Apr. 6, 2015) ("[I]t is not appropriate in this case to mandate that the new expert
 3 'rubber-stamp' the expert report previously provided. Nonetheless, the new expert report may not
 4 provide an opinion that is contrary to or inconsistent with [prior expert's] opinion. . . . While the
 5 opinions need not be identical, it is reasonable to limit the new expert to findings that are
 6 substantially similar to those presented by [prior expert]." (internal citation omitted)).

7 Walmart will serve Dr. Cromarty's replacement non-infringement report, and make Dr.
 8 Cromarty available for deposition in relation to his replacement non-infringement report, in
 9 accordance with the schedule to be entered by the Court. Eolas reserves the right to object to any
 10 portions of Dr. Cromarty's replacement non-infringement report that are contrary to, inconsistent
 11 with, or not substantially similar to the original McGoveran Report or on any other grounds.

12 The Parties respectfully request that the Court enter the attached proposed order governing
 13 the replacement expert report of Dr. Cromarty.

14

15 DATED: June 18, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

16 By: /s/ James E. Quigley

17
 18 John B. Campbell (admitted pro hac vice)
 19 Josh W. Budwin (admitted pro hac vice)
 James E. Quigley (admitted pro hac vice)
20 McKool Smith, P.C.
 21 303 Colorado Street, Suite 2100
 Austin, Texas 78701
 22 Telephone: (512) 692-8700
 Facsimile: (512) 692-8744
 jcampbell@McKoolSmith.com
 jbudwin@McKoolSmith.com
 jquigley@McKoolSmith.com

23

24 Eliza Beeney (admitted pro hac vice)
25 McKool Smith, P.C.
 One Manhattan West
 26 395 9th Avenue, 50th Floor
 New York, New York 10001
 Telephone: (212) 402-9400
 Facsimile: (212) 402-9444

27

1 ebeeney@McKoolSmith.com
2

3 Alan P. Block (State Bar No. 143783)
4 **McKool Smith Hennigan, P.C.**
5 300 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
6 Los Angeles, California 90071
7 Telephone (213) 694-1200
8 Facsimile (213) 694-1234
9 ablock@McKoolSmith.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
11 *Eolas Technologies Incorporated*

12 By: /s/ Bijal V. Vakil
13 Bijal V. Vakil

14 Attorneys for Defendant
15 WALMART INC.

16 Bijal V. Vakil (SBN 192878)
17 Shamita D. Etienne-Cummings (SBN 202090)
18 Eric E. Lancaster (SBN 244449)
19 Henry Huang (SBN 252832)
20 WHITE & CASE LLP
21 3000 El Camino Real Two Palo Alto Square,
22 9th Floor
23 Palo Alto, CA 94306
24 Telephone: (650) 213-0300
25 Facsimile: (650) 213-8158
26 Email: bvakil@whitecase.com
27 Email: setienne@whitecase.com
28 Email: eric.lancaster@whitecase.com
Email: henry.huang@whitecase.com
John R. Keville (admitted pro hac vice)
Robert L. Green, III (admitted pro hac vice)
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1111 Louisiana Street, 25th Floor
Houston, TX 77002-5242
Telephone: (713) 651-2600
Facsimile: (713) 651-2700
Email: jkeville@winston.com
Email: rlgreen@winston.com
Counsel for Defendant
WALMART INC.

ATTESTATION

I, James E. Quigley, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred in this filing.

DATED: June 18, 2021

/s/ James E. Quigley

James E. Quigley